Atty. Docket No. 42P19078 Examiner Rampuria, Sharad K. TC/A.U. 2688

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 29 and 39 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Thus, claims 1-46 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-46 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,681,109 issued to Leifer (*Leifer*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,650,902 issued to Richton (*Richton*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1-46 are not rendered obvious by *Leifer* and *Richton*.

Claim 1 recites:

receiving customer information corresponding to a customerprovided wireless device from a party including one or more customers requesting services from a service establishment that provides services to customers within the service establishment;

generating service availability information corresponding to at least an estimated time until the requested services are available in response to receiving the customer information; and

providing, to a wireless service provider that provides wireless services to the customer-provided wireless device, the service availability information.

Thus, Applicants claim providing service availability information including an estimated time until requested services are available from a service establishment that provides services to customers within the service establishment. For example, a user may be apprised of a wait time for a table at a restaurant at which the user has provided customer information. The method of claim 1 may be applied to other service establishments as well. Claims 7 and 13 recite similar limitations.

Atty. Docket No. 42P19078 Examiner Rampuria, Sharad K. TC/A.U. 2688

Applicants agree with the Office Action that Leifer fails to teach a customerprovided wireless device. Applicants submit that Leifer further fails to disclose other
limitations recited in the claims. The Office Action asserts that Richton is analogous to
Leifer. Applicants disagree with this assertion. Leifer discloses a server call system in
which a customer may be in contact with a server at all times. See Abstract. Richton
discloses a system that provides location-specific information to travelers. See Abstract.
Other than both having a wireless component, Leifer and Richton are not analogous.

Nevertheless, even if *Leifer* and *Richton* are combined the resulting teachings and suggestions do not render the claimed invention obvious. Neither *Leifer* nor *Richton* disclose or even suggest information corresponding to at least an estimated time until the requested services are available. Because neither *Leifer* nor *Richton* teach or suggest this limitation, no combination of *Leifer* and *Richton* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1, 7 and 13. Applicants submit that the combination of *Leifer* and *Richton* suffer from further deficiencies.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1. Claims 8-12 depend from claim 7. Claims 14-18 depend from claim 13. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18 are not rendered obvious by *Leifer* and *Richton* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 19 recites:

receiving customer information corresponding to a customerprovided wireless device from a party including one or more customers requesting services from a service establishment that provides services to customers within the service establishment;

generating service availability information corresponding to at least an estimated time until the requested services are available in response to receiving the customer information; and

Atty. Docket No. 42P19078 Examiner Rampuria, Sharad K. TC/A.U. 2688

providing, to the customer-provided wireless device, the service availability information.

Thus, Applicants claim providing service availability information including an estimated time until requested services are available from a service establishment that provides services to customers within the service establishment. Claims 29 and 39 recite similar limitations.

As discussed above, neither *Leifer* nor *Richton* disclose or even suggest information corresponding to at least an estimated time until the requested services are available. Because neither *Leifer* nor *Richton* teach or suggest this limitation, no combination of *Leifer* and *Richton* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 19, 29 and 39. Applicants submit that the combination of *Leifer* and *Richton* suffer from further deficiencies.

Claims 20-28 depend from claim 19. Claims 30-38 depend from claim 29. Claims 40-46 depend from claim 39. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 20-28, 30-38 and 40-46 are not rendered obvious by *Leifer* and *Richton* for at least the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-46 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Atty. Docket No. 42P19078 Examiner Rampuria, Sharad K. TC/A.U. 2688

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

02-2666.

AUG 2 5 2093

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: Aug 25, 2006

Paul A. Mendonsa

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026 (503) 439-8778